### Santa Cruz County, Arizona DIRM and Map Modernization Project

TDN Section 4 – Hydrology



June 8, 2007



## Santa Cruz County DIRM and Map Modernization Project

### **Table of Contents**

SECTIO	N 4: HYDROLOGY	.1
4.1 N	lethod Description	. 1
4.1.	1 Limited Detailed Study Reaches	. 1
4.1.	2 Detailed Study Reaches	. 2
4.2 P	arameter Estimation	. 2
4.2.	1 Drainage Area Boundaries	.3
4.2.	2 Watershed Work Maps	. 3
4.2.	3 Gage Data	. 4
4.2.	4 Statistical Parameters	.4
4.2.	5 Precipitation	. 4
4.2.	6 Physical Parameters	. 5
	.2.6.1 Rainfall Losses	
4	.2.6.2 Unit Hydrograph	. 5
4	.2.6.3 Channel Routing	.7
4.3 P	roblems Encountered During the Study	.7
4.3.	1 Modeling Warning and Error Messages	.7
4.4 C	alibration	. 8
4.5 F	inal Results	. 8
4.6 R	eferences	.9

### **APPENDICES**

Appendix A Peak Discharge Summaries

Appendix B Watershed Maps for Detail Study Reaches

Appendix C HEC-1 Models (CD)



### **SECTION 4: HYDROLOGY**

### 4.1 Method Description

The hydrologic methodology employed for the overall study was separated into two groups: limited detailed study reaches and their associated contributing watersheds and detailed study reaches and their associated contributing watersheds. Peak discharges for the 100-year event were determined for each stream reach. Additional discharges for the 10-, 50- and 500-year storm events were determined for detail study streams which have multiple profiles in the existing Flood Insurance Studies (FIS) for Santa Cruz County, Arizona (FEMA, August 23, 2000) and the City of Nogales, Arizona (FEMA, October 15, 1980).

### 4.1.1 Limited Detailed Study Reaches

Peak discharges for limited detail study reaches, with the exception of Puerto Canyon, were determined utilizing USGS regional regression equations (USGS) and Arizona Department of Water Resources State Standard (SS) 02-96 (ADWR) for Region 13, multiplied by a factor of 1.6. Experience indicated that regional regression equations alone produce low values for peak discharges in Santa Cruz County. This phenomenon is attributed to a lack of an adequate sample of gaged streams in Santa Cruz County. In addition, the average standard error for 100-year peak discharges determined by the regression equation is ±48 %. The factor was determined based upon a comparison of peak discharges determined by HEC modeling developed for two (2) watersheds within Santa Cruz County and peak discharges determined by Pima County methodology for three (3) representative watersheds of variable area in Santa Cruz County. The 100-year peak discharge for Puerto Canyon was determined from a previous study, utilizing HEC-1 (C.L. Williams). Peak flows for limited detail streams within a detail study watershed were determined utilizing the following HEC-1 methodology.

### 4.1.2 Detailed Study Reaches

Peak discharges for detailed study streams with the exception of Nogales Wash (Potrero Creek) and the Santa Cruz River, were determined utilizing HEC-1. The physical processes were determined by the following components.

- Rainfall NOAA Atlas 14
- Rainfall Distribution Hypothetical
- Rainfall Losses Green and Ampt
- Rainfall Transformation Clark Unit Hydrograph
- Rainfall Translation Modified Puls

These components are consistent with the Hydrologic Modeling Guidelines State Standard (SS10-07) developed by the Arizona Department of Water Resources State Standards Work Group.

Peak discharges for Portero Creek and Nogales Wash (including the portion downstream of the confluence with Potrero Creek, which is currently called Potrero Creek) and the Santa Cruz River were determined from US Army Corps of Engineers 2001 and 2003 studies (see References).

### 4.2 Parameter Estimation

Contributing watershed area is the only hydrologic parameter required for the limited detail reaches. This is the only parameter required for the Region 13 Regression Equation used for this study group.

The estimation of hydrologic parameters for the detailed reaches was performed in accordance with guidelines provided within SS10-07.

### 4.2.1 Drainage Area Boundaries

The limits of the overall study area are generally those regions contributing runoff to the Santa Cruz River which drains north into Pima County. One study stream, Lyle Canyon drains east into Cochise County. In general, the majority of those regions contributing runoff to the Santa Cruz River are located within Santa Cruz County Nogales Wash, and Ephriam Canyon Wash have headwaters in Sonora, Mexico; south of Santa Cruz County. The Santa Cruz Rivers has headwaters in eastern Santa Cruz County, however the stream drains south into Mexico and reenters Santa Cruz County east of Nogales. Nearly 75 percent of the region that contributes runoff to Sopori Wash is located within the eastern portion of Pima County.

The total watershed area evaluated under this study, excluding the Santa Cruz River and Nogales Wash watersheds is approximately 750 square miles. Of the total area evaluated, nearly 677 square miles is accounted for within the detailed study reach group.

Watershed characteristics vary throughout the study areas and can be segmented into two broad general characteristics: steep and shallow watersheds. Steep watersheds are those with the majority of the hydraulic flow path (often called the Tc Path) having slopes greater than 200 feet per mile. Shallow watersheds have a majority of the Tc Path(s) with a slope less than 200 feet per mile. Vegetative coverage for both of these types of systems tends to be within a range of 20-40 percent. Soil types are predominately sandy loam.

### 4.2.2 Watershed Work Maps

Work maps were developed using LIDAR point data developed for this project and 7.5-minute quadrangles as published by the United States Geological Survey. Watershed maps for Detail streams are shown in

Appendix B.

### 4.2.3 Gage Data

Gage data is limited within the study area, and the reliability of associated statistical 100-year peak discharges values are "uncertain, and potential errors are large" (Pope). One gage, Sopori Wash at Amando, Arizona (09481750), has been inactive since 1978 and the length of recorded data is only 30 years. The estimate of the peak discharge, during the 100-year event, is 17,100 (Pope). A gage on Sonoita Creek near Patagonia (09481500) has records for 1930-72, 1978 and 1984. The estimate for 100-year peak discharge is 15,100 cfs. The 100-year peak discharge for Calabasas Canyon near Nogales, Arizona (09481700) is 2540 cfs. for records from 1963-76 and 1978. Gages for the Santa Cruz River were considered within the Corps study.

### 4.2.4 Statistical Parameters

In general there are no significant periods of rainfall and stream flow available.

### 4.2.5 Precipitation

Precipitation data for the centroid of the watershed was obtained from the National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration data server which utilizes NOAA Atlas 14 data applicable to Arizona (NOAA). In accordance with SS10-07 guidance, a hypothetical storm is developed in HEC-1 based on the storm duration, reduction factor, area of the specific watershed, and Depth-Duration-Frequency (DDF) data.

No comparison of the hypothetical rainfall pattern to rainfall patterns on record or by other hydrologic study was performed given the lack of available information.

### 4.2.6 Physical Parameters

### 4.2.6.1 Rainfall Losses

Rainfall loss methodology consists of an estimation of surface retention (IA) based on land use type(s) and rainfall infiltration losses by the Green-Ampt loss equation. Surface retention loss values are based on land use conditions (e.g., rangeland, mountain, hillside, developed...etc.).

Soil horizon information was obtained through review of the Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Surveys (NRCS, 1979 and 1993). Land use conditions were obtained by the USGSS Gap Analysis (USGS 2005).

Green-Ampt equation parameters are estimated as a function of soil texture. Parameters consist of porosity (DTHETA), saturated hydraulic conductivity (XKSAT), and the wetting front soil suction head (PSIF). Hydraulic conductivity is adjusted based on vegetative ground cover. Typical values for these parameters are provided within the ADOT guidelines. Hydrologic modeling also took into consideration the percent of impervious area due to land use types. Impervious regions are those regions that have no rainfall losses (RTIMP). Values of impervious areas, soil characteristics, and vegetative coverage were taken from several references along with field investigation.

### 4.2.6.2 Unit Hydrograph

SS10-07 methodology utilizes the Clark Unit Hydrograph. The unit hydrograph is solely based on physical basin parameters as shown in the following equations.

$$T_c = 2.4 A^{0.1} L^{0.25} L_{ca}^{0.25} S^{-0.2}$$
 (Desert/Mountain, SS10-07, eq. 3.2)

$$T_c = 3.2 \ A^{.1} \ L^{.25} \ L_{ca}^{.25} \ S^{-.14} \ RTIMP^{-.36}$$
 (Urban, SS10-07, eq. 3.4)

Where;

 $T_c$  – Time of Concentration in hours

A – Area in square miles

 Length of the flow path to the hydraulically most distance point in miles

 $L_{ca}$  - Length along L to a point opposite the centroid in miles

S – Average slope of L in feet per mile, adjusted per FCDMC methodology

RTIMP effective impervious area, in percent.

A storage coefficient is also computed and is a Clark Unit Hydrograph parameter that relates the effects of direct storage in the watershed to unit hydrograph shape.

$$R = 0.37 T_c^{1.11} A^{-0.57} L^{0.80}$$
 (SS10-07 eq. 3.5)

Where,

R is in hours and the variables are as defined for the  $T_{\text{c}}$  equations.

The time-area relation is a graphical unit hydrographic parameter that specifies the accumulated area of the watershed that is contributing runoff

to the outlet of the watershed at any time. The ADOT Dimensionless Synthetic Time-Area Relations as specified in SS10-07 were utilized.

Per SS10-07 guidelines, the hydrograph duration, used for modeling was the 3-hour, 6-hour or 24-hour period, based on the Time of Concentration (Tc) for the entire stream watershed under consideration.

### 4.6.2.3 Channel Routing

The Modified-Puls methodology was employed for channel routing.

### 4.3 Problems Encountered During the Study

No problems were encountered during the analyses.

### 4.3.1 Modeling Warning and Error Messages

No errors were encountered during the analysis.

Warning messages were encountered during channel routing operations for several concentration points within each hydrologic model (i.e., HEC-1). The following is an example of the warning message encountered.

\*\*\* WARNING \*\*\* MODIFIED PULS ROUTING MAY BE NUMERICALLY UNSTABLE FOR OUTFLOWS BETWEEN 0. TO 1005672. THE ROUTED HYDROGRAPH SHOULD BE EXAMINED FOR OSCILLATIONS OR OUTFLOWS GREATER THAN PEAK INFLOWS. THIS CAN BE CORRECTED BY DECREASING THE TIME INTERVAL OR INCREASING STORAGE (USE A LONGER REACH.)

A close examination of each routed hydrograph found that no unusual irregularities or oscillations occurred, therefore, no solution or additional steps appeared warranted.

### 4.4 Calibration

Once modeling results were obtained and reviewed calibration of the models were not performed given the limited information (e.g., gage data, previous FEMA or other hydrologic studies) available for this region.

### 4.5 Final Results

A summary of the peak discharges for the limited detail and detail streams in included in Appendix A. HEC-1 input and output data for detail streams is provided on CD in Appendix C.

### 4.6 References

Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR), July 1996, "Requirement for Floodplain and Floodway Delineation in Riverine Environments", State Standard (SS) 2-96.

Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR), May 2007 (Draft), "Hydrologic Modeling Guidelines", State Standard (SS) 10-07.

Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR), November 1997, "Requirement for Flood Study Technical Documentation", State Standard (SS)1-97.

C.L. Williams Consulting, Inc., September 30, 2004, "Concept Study Report, Balderrain Wash, Conceptual Drainage Solutions."

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Federal Insurance Administration, August 23, 2000, "Flood Insurance Study, Santa Cruz County, Arizona", Community Number 040090.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Federal Insurance Administration, October 15, 1980, "Flood Insurance Study, City of Nogales, Arizona, Santa Cruz County", Community Number 040091.

National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) data server: http://hdsc.nws.noaa.gov/hdsc/pfds/sa/az\_pfds.html

Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), April 1979, "Soil Survey of Santa Cruz and Parts of Cochise and Pima Counties, Arizona".

Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), 1993, "Soil Survey of Pima County, Arizona, Eastern Part".

Pope, G.L., RIGAS P.D. and Smith, C.F., United States Geological Survey, 1998, "Statistical Summaries of Streamflow Data and Characteristics of Drainage Basins for Selected Streamflow-Gaging Stations in Arizona through Water Year 1996", Water-Resources Investigations Report 98-4225.

United States Geological Survey (USGS), 1997, "Methods for Estimating Magnitude and Frequency of Floods in the Southwestern United States", Water-Supply Paper 2433.

United States Geological Survey (USGS), October 13, 2005, "The Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project, Final Report on Land Cover Mapping Methods".

United States Army Corps of Engineers. August 2001, "Gila River, Santa Cruz River Watershed, Pima County, Arizona, Final Feasibility Report".

United States Army Corps of Engineers, August 2003, "Nogales Wash & Tributaries, Nogales, Arizona, Limited Reevaluation Report and Environmental Evaluation, Final".

## **APPENDIX A**

**Peak Discharge Summaries** 

			į	4	Regional Regression	gression						
Reach Name	Study Type	Location		sub basin	Equation*	with Factor^		HEC-1	7		Drainage Area	es.
		minimum in a managara ang managar			100 YR (cfs)	100 YR (cfs)	500 YR (cfs)	100 YR (cfs)	<b>50 YR</b> (cfs)	10YR (cfs)	(sa.mi.)	
₹	ء ا		- 0000	-	-		10077	1000	70101	10000		-
Agua Fila	<u> </u>	Downstream	S 5000			-	761.51	3801	8CS/	0238	44.60	
		West Frontage Koad	883		-		14186	9863	GS6/	6535	44.46	
		f # #	C007	1	1	4	13839	9651	7795	6407	42.41	
			9000		1	1	13593	9500	7689	6327	40.33	
		\$ \$ \$	C004	ļ	1		12388	8722	7101	5853	35.14	********
		Upstream	C003	l	***	1	5266 I	3508	2885	2343	11.06	
Agua Fria Canyon Tributary 1	9	Above Confluence	***	!	1818	2909	4194	200	!		1.77	
Al Harrison Wash	9	Upstream	1	-	268	429	1	1	1	1	0.13	
Al Harrison Wash	Δ	Downstream		l	1373	2197	na	na	na	Б	1.14	
Calabasas Canyon	9	Above Confluence with Santa Cruz	l		4784	7654	l			1	9.8	
Caralampi Canyon	9	Above Confluence with Santa Cruz	!	***	3064	4902	1	ł	***	ļ	4.26	
Caralampi Canyon Trib 2	9	Downstream (above confluence)	l		1309	2094		1		1	1.06	
Caralampi Canyon Trib 3	9	Downstream (above confluence)	1		1164	1862			1	ŀ	0.89	
Ephriam Canyon		Upstream Grand (Culvert Inlet)	25		* At a		5272	3763	3115	1744	7	
		Downstream I-19	4	 	}	-	4799	3460	2903	1610	9	
		Upstream Highway 189 International Boundary	တ က			****	4417 3898	3160 2753	2681 2326	1473	5.4 4.79	
Farosa Canyon	۵	Above confluence with Lyle	112	1	ļ	ŀ	2032	1388	1100	595	2.3	
	۵	( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )	9			***************************************	000	i i	9	6		
nai silaw Cieek	۵۵	Above collinelice with Red Rock Canyon Confluence with Red Rock Canyon	J32 J32	Ω7		1 1 1	14217	8601	3149 6725	1390 2955	32.5 64.1	
Josephine Canyon	۵۵	Confluence with Santa Cruz Upstream Limit	30	. ! !	1	de service de	28657 23137	19594 16036	15919 13103	8211 7075	49.1 39.6	
Josephine Canyon Trib 1	9	Downstream	ļ	-	1	i	g	630	na	na	1.28	
Josephine Canyon Trib 5	9	Downstream			}		B	672	20	ns	9.1	
Kino Springs Wash	99	Upstream Downstream		. 1 1	1682	2691 3005		1 1			1.56 1.86	

A decade	F. 1911		Conc.	Sub -	Regional Regression	egression					
Neachi Naille	atuuy 1ype	Location	Point	basin	Equation*	with Factor^		HEC-1	ī		Drainage Area
					100 YR (cfs)	100 YR (cfs)	500 YR (cfs)	100 YR (cfs)	<b>50 YR</b> (cfs)	10YR (cfs)	(sq.mi.)
Lyle Canyon	a	Lyle Canyon (U/S Confl w/ Farosa)	J13		1		10730	7527	6258	3498	23
i	۵	Lyle (Confluence w/ Farosa Canyon)	112	1		1	12029	8426	9869	3789	25.3
	٥	Lyle Canyon (Below Conflu w/ Woodward)	715	i		į	13067	0606	7466	3964	27.1
	9	County Boundary	910	1	l	}	16121	na	па	ē	32
Maria Santisima Del Carmen Wash	9	Above Split	1		742	1187	1	Ī			0.47
	9	Above Confluence with 41.2.1	1	1	296	1547	1	I	1	}	0.68
	9 !	Confluence with 41.2.1	ı		1190	1904	1	A cabolic		ŀ	0.92
	9	Confluence with Santa Cruz	1		4048	6477	1	-	l	I	7.1
Negro Canyon	9	Above Confluence with Santa Cruz	ž į		2658	4253			-1		3.32
Peck Canyon	۵	Interstate 19	6000	l	1	1	25570	18315	15700	9632	47.49
		* * 1	8000			<u> </u>	25373	18220	15624		46.29
		1 1	C007	ŀ	ŀ	!	24710	17798	15248	9477	43.70
		1 1	9000	Í	-	!	23595	17095	14621	9223	40.24
		Upstream	C005	*	}	1	19184	13876	11891	7520	32.26
Peck Canyon Tributary 1	9	Above Confluence			1431	2289	1		***		1.21
Potrero Creek Trib 1	9	Downstream	į		1451	2322	1		1		1.24
Puerto Wash	9	Interstate 19		1	1	1	na	6500	na	na	7
Ramanote Canyon	9	Above Confluence with Peck Canyon	.	1		-	3300	na	na	na	7.50
Red Rock Canyon	۵	Above Confluence with Harshaw	J32	32	1	- Little	8905	5497	4208	1832	31.6
											•
Santa Cruz River Trib 14	9	Upstream		ŀ	1309	2094	ļ	*	1	ſ	1.06
Santa Cruz River Tributary 15	9	1			1633	2613		1		l	1.49
Santa Cruz River Trib 16	9	Confluence w/tributary		***	1988	3181				ļ	2.04
Santa Cruz River Trib 17	9	Downstream	İ		2172	3475		3 4			2.36
Santa Cruz River Trib 17	9	Downstream	1	ľ	1064	1702		***	treet	ļ	0.78
	_	******	_				_				

;			Conc.	Sub	Regional Regression	gression					
Keach Name	Study Type	Location	Point	basin	Equation*	with Factor^		HEC-1	ম		Drainage Area
	***************************************	**************************************			100 YR	100 YR	500 YR	100 YR	50 YR	10YR	
					(cts)	(cfs)	(cts)	(cts)	(cts)	(cts)	(sq.mi.)
Santa Cruz River Trib 18	9	Downstream	**	*******	1267	2027	*****	}	1		1.01
Santa Cruz River Trib 19	9	Upstream	ţ	1	947	1515	l			I	0.66
Santa Cruz River Trib 20	9	Downstream	ſ	***	1082	1731	l			1	0.8
Santa Cruz River Trib 21	O .	Upstream	1		1225	1960	1	}			0.96
Santa Cruz River Trib 22	9	Downstream			1325	2120	1	1	1	l	1.08
Santa Cruz River Trib 24	g,	Upstream			1514	2418	]	1		l	1.32
Santa Cruz River Trib 25	q	Downstream	l	1	1853	2965	1	1			1.82
Santa Cruz River Trib 28	9	Upstream	***	* .	7.76	1563					0.69
Santa Cruz River Trib 29 Santa Cruz River Trib 29	99	Downstream Upstream		1	1155 1155	1848 1848	1 1	1	11		0.88 0.88
Santa Cruz River Trib 30	9	Downstream			1381	2210		I	***	l	1.15
Santa Cruz River Trib 39.1	97	Upstream Trib 39.3			947	1515	1	į	-	l	0.66
Santa Cruz River Trib 39.2	9	Above Confluence with 39.3	***	***	1276	2042	-	}	l		1.02
Santa Cruz River Trib 39.3	g	Confluence with 39.3	1	<b> </b>	1682	2691					1.56
Santa Cruz River Trib 39.3	Q7	Upstream Confluence with 39.1			821	1314	l	I	-	1	0.54
Santa Cruz River Trib 41.2.1	9	Above Confluence with	se was	1	445	712	1	l		1	0.24
Santa Cruz River Trib 41.2.2	9	Maria Santisima Del Carmen Wash	ı	ı							
Sonoita Creek	٥٩٩٥٥	Confluence w/ Harshaw and Red Rock Downstream Patagonia Patagonia Lake Upstream Limit Detail Study Confluence w/Santa Cruz	31 44 46 52 55		1111		27660 35406 36139 34309 34477	17253 21038 22124 20451 20514	12879 15584 15664 15373 15389	5374 7193 7390 6701 6705	137.8 205.2 215.5 246.2 258.3
Sonoita Tributary 1	Ω	At Confluence with Sonoita Creek		33.5		1	1080	821	710	461	2.01

			0	3	Regional Regression	egression						
Reach Name	Study Type	Location	Point i	sup - basin	Point basin Equation*	with Factor^		HEC-1	<u>5</u>		Drainage Area	
		A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A			100 YR	100 YR	500 YR	500 YR 100 YR 50 YR 10YR	50 YR	10YR		1
Attached Annie Andrews					(cfs)	(cfs)	(cts)	(cts)	(cfs)	(cts)	(sq.mi.)	
Sopori Wash	۵	Downstream	C011		ŀ	*****	19044	12338	9776	4965	166,79	
	**********	Interstate 19	C010	1	ļ		19052	12341	9817	4992	166.01	
	·····	{	600O	1	ŀ		19003	12305	9805	4986	162.00	
		<u>i</u> 	C008	!	******	;	17409	9671	9142	4727	137.56	
		Upstream	C007	1	***		14757	7846	7846	4210	111.05	
Teruno Canyon	9	Above Confluence with Agua Fria			ŀ	ł	009	na	na	na E	3.29	
Tinaja Canyon	9	Above Confluence with Santa Cruz	1		1910	3057	1	1	ļ		1.91	
Tumacacori Canyon	9	Above Confluence with Santa Cruz	1	ł	2799	4478		ļ	-		3.63	······································
Woodward Canyon	۵	Above confluence with Lyle Canyon	315		;	***************************************	2075	1504	1264	737	8.	
Yerba Buena Canyon	9	Upstream	}	ļ	1405	2248	1	I	-		1.18	
	9	Downstream (Falls Wash)			3032	4851		1	1		4.18	

The state of the s	C		500-Year	100-Year	50-Year	10-Year	V
Reach Name	COLIC: POINT	Flooding Source	Peak	Peak	Peak	Peak	Urainage Area
			(cfs)	(cfs)	(cfs)	(cfs)	(sq.mi.)
Santa Cruz 07	~	International Border*	76800	32000	23040	11200	532
	2	Highway 82 Bridge	78000	32500	23400	11380	574
	2a	Downstream of Cumero Canyon	79200	33000	23760	11550	603
Santa Cruz 06	2b	Downstream of Burro Canyon	79560	33150	23870	11600	610
	2c	D/S of Guevavi Canyon (U/S of Ruby Rd.)	79920	33300	23980	11660	620
Santa Cruz 05	က	Railroad Bridge near RR S. Industrial Park	83760	34900	25130	12220	722
	4	Rio Rico Drive	93600	39000	28080	13650	1000
Santa Cruz 04	S)	Confluence with Agua Fria Wash	95280	39700	28580	13900	1045
	9	Confluence with Peck Canyon Wash	97200	40500	29160	14180	1097
Santa Cruz 03		Confluene with Joesphine Canyon Wash	99360	41400	29810	14490	1163
Santa Cruz 02	80	Bridge Road in Tubac	100800	42000	30240	14700	1209
Santa Cruz 01	Ō	Amado-Montosa Road	103200	43000	30960	15050	1279
	9	Pima/Santa Cruz County Line*	108000	45000	32400	15750	1448
				•			
Upper Nogales	ľ	International Boundary	32400	13500	9720	3780	27.4
	-	Nogales Covered Floodway	0009	0009	0009	2350	
		Arroyo Covered Floodway	2060	1600	1500	230	
	1	Overland Flow Total	24340	2000	2220	840	
	7	Overland Flow West of RR	14114	3360	1353	540	ţ
	1111	At Ephriam Canyon	36240	15100	10870	4230	35.8
		At 4.083 miles	38640	16100	11590	4510	40.9
	ļ	At Mariposa Canyon	45120	18800	13540	5260	56.5
	1	At Railroad bridge	45840	19100	13750	5350	58.4
	1	City Limits (just u/s Potrero)	46800	19500	14040	5460	61
Potrero 01	P3	At Potrero Creek	52320	21800	15700	0699	76.1
	P4	Downstream of S. River Rd.	54840	22850	16450	7010	83.25
	P5	At Pickrell Bridge (Old Tucson)	57120	23800	17140	7310	90.3
	P6	At Santa Cruz River	58080	24200	17420	7430	93.4

mi.)	FIS	n/a	14.4	11.3	n/a
(sd:	JEF	14.06	13.51	11.58	10.5
(cfs)		2070	1990	1710	1540
(cfs)		5330	5110	4390	3960
(cfs)	COE	7400	7100	6100	2200
(cfs)		17760	17040	14640	13200
		Upstream of Nogales Wash	At U.S. Highway 89 Bridge	At Western Corporate Limits	Proposed u/s limit of study
		P3	P2	P1a	P1a
		Potrero 02			
	(cfs) (cfs)	(cfs)         (cfs)         (sq.mi.)                     COE                   JEF	(cfs)         (cfs)         (cfs)         (cfs)         (sq.mi.)           P3         Upstream of Nogales Wash         17760         7400         5330         2070         14.06	(cfs)         (cfs)         (cfs)         (cfs)         (sq.mi.)           P3         Upstream of Nogales Wash         17760         7400         5330         2070         14.06           P2         At U.S. Highway 89 Bridge         17040         7100         5110         1990         13.51	(cfs) (cfs) (cfs) (cfs) (cfs) (13) (cfs) (

Note: Based on results of the HEC-1 analysis, which generated discharges that were generally less than the COE value at US 89, the discharges at the remaining concentration points were defined using a Discharge to Area (Q/A) ratio relative to the COE value a US 89 and JEF's drainage areas.

## **APPENDIX B**

**Watershed Maps** 

For Detail Study Reaches

## **APPENDIX C**

HEC-1 Models

### **HEC-1 MODELS**

	100YR	500YR	50YR	10YR		
Stream Reach					Input	Output
Agua Fria	AGUA100YR	AGUA500YR	AGUA50YR	AGUA10YR	.lH1	.OH1
Ephriam Canyon	EPH100YR	EPH500YR	EPH50YR	EPH500YR	.DAT	.OUT
Josephine Canyon	JOS100YR	JOS500YR	JOS50YR	JOS10YR	.DAT	.OUT
Lyle Canyon	LY100YR	LY500YR	LY50YR	LY10YR	.DAT	.OUT
Peck Canyon	PEC100YR	PEC500YR	PEC50YR	PEC10YR	.lH1	.OH1
Sonoita Creek	SON100FINAL	SON500FINAL	SON50FINAL	SON10FINAL	.DAT	.OUT
Sopori Wash	SOP100YRS	SOP500YRS	SOP50YRS	SOP10YRS	.IH1	.OH1